

International Journal of Modern Physics A
 © World Scientific Publishing Company

The $1/N_c$ Approach for Baryon Resonances

Richard F. Lebed

Department of Physics & Astronomy, Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ 85287-1504, USA

I give a brief overview of the model-independent analysis of unstable baryon resonances in the $1/N_c$ QCD expansion. This approach produces numerous surprising semi-quantitative phenomenological predictions that are supported by available observations.

1. Introduction

This talk briefly summarizes a growing body of work^{1,2,3,4,5,6,7} done with Tom Cohen on unstable baryon resonances in the $1/N_c$ QCD expansion. More in-depth synopses appear in Ref. 8.

The $1/N_c$ expansion about the large N_c QCD limit has been extensively used to study baryons treated as stable states. At $N_c=3$ the lowest-lying baryons fill a completely symmetric spin-flavor SU(6) representation, the **56**. Although the lightest $N_c>3$ baryons have N_c valence quarks, the SU(6) representation remains symmetric, as one shows⁹ by imposing order-by-order (in $1/N_c$) unitarity in πN scattering (*consistency conditions*). Low-spin baryons in this multiplet (analogues to N , Δ) are split in mass at $O(1/N_c)$,¹⁰ meaning that such states are stable for large N_c . Such analyses use a Hamiltonian $\mathcal{H}$ with asymptotic baryon eigenstates, which is expanded in SU(6)-breaking operators accompanied by powers of $1/N_c$.

Baryon resonances, on the other hand, generically lie above the ground-state multiplet by an $O(N_c^0)$ mass gap; since mesons like π have $O(N_c^0)$ masses, such states are generically unstable against strong decay. While treating excited multiplets like the arbitrary- N_c analogue of the SU(6) **70** using a Hamiltonian approach has produced many interesting phenomenological results, such a treatment for resonances is not entirely reasonable since it entails grafting *ad hoc* sources of $q\bar{q}$ pairs (the production/decay mechanism) onto $\mathcal{H}$, violating unitarity. Moreover, resonances in such an $\mathcal{H}$ are not manifested as excited states of stable baryons.

In fact, a resonance R is properly represented by a complex-valued pole in a scattering amplitude at position $z_R = M_R - i\Gamma_R/2$. Such an approach can be developed using tools originally appearing in the context of chiral soliton models, for such models naturally accommodate baryon resonances as excitations resulting from scattering of mesons off ground-state baryons. They are consistent with the large N_c limit because the solitons are heavy, semiclassical objects compared to the mesons. In contrast to quark models, chiral soliton models tend to fall short in providing

detailed spectroscopy and decay parameters for baryon resonances, particularly at higher energies. Nevertheless, one may use the scattering or soliton *picture* (no specific model) to study baryon resonances as well as the full scattering amplitudes in which they appear, and relate it for N_c large to the Hamiltonian or quark *picture*.

2. Amplitude Relations

The relevant physical observables in real data are scattering amplitudes, in which resonances appear as complex poles. The role of large N_c is to treat the ground-state baryon, off which mesons scatter, as a heavy field manifesting the consistency conditions. These conditions turn out to impose¹¹ t-channel constraints: Amplitudes with $|I_t - J_t| = n$ first appear at order (both relative and absolute) N_c^{-n} , leading to relations among the amplitudes holding at various orders in $1/N_c$. The t-channel expressions may be reexpressed in the s channel using group-theoretical crossing relations, in which the $I_t = J_t$ rule becomes¹² the statement that the underlying dynamical degrees of freedom are *reduced amplitudes* s labeled by K , the eigenvalue of $\mathbf{K} \equiv \mathbf{I} + \mathbf{J}$. The πN and ηN partial waves of orbital angular momentum L are

$$L_{IJ}^\pi = 2 \sum_K (2K+1) \left\{ \begin{matrix} K & I & J \\ & L & 1 \end{matrix} \right\}^2 s_{KLL}^\pi, \quad L_{IJ}^\eta = s_{LL}^\eta, \quad (1)$$

respectively, which are special cases of an expression^{2,13} that holds for ground-state baryons of arbitrary spin (= isospin) and mesons of arbitrary spin and isospin.

Expressions like (1) are useful because full observable partial waves outnumber reduced amplitudes s , giving rise to a number of linear relations among the measured amplitudes that hold at leading $[O(N_c^0)]$ order. A pole in one partial wave implies a pole in one of the s , which in turn contributes to several others partial waves. A single pole therefore generates a multiplet of baryon resonances degenerate in mass and width.¹ Moreover, the existence of an s-channel pole in an intermediate state cannot depend upon the states used to form it (except through conservation of quantum numbers), and so the resonant poles are labeled uniquely by K .

For example, Eqs. (1) applied to $I = \frac{1}{2}$, $J^P = \frac{1}{2}^-$ states ($N_{1/2}$) gives $S_{11}^\pi = s_{100}^\pi$ and $S_{11}^\eta = s_0^\eta$, while in the $I = \frac{1}{2}$, $J^P = \frac{3}{2}^-$ ($N_{3/2}$) channel, $D_{13}^\pi = \frac{1}{2}(s_{122}^\pi + s_{222}^\pi)$ (parity being determined by L). A pole in S_{11}^π ($K=1$) implies a degenerate pole in D_{13}^π , because the latter contains a $K=1$ amplitude. Clearly, degenerate towers of resonances develop with $K=0, 1, 2$, etc. On the other hand, one type of $N_{1/2}$ pole ($K=1$) couples predominantly to π and the other ($K=0$) to η .

In comparison, the quark-picture large N_c analogue of the excited multiplet $(\mathbf{70}, 1^-)$ has 2 $N_{1/2}$ and 2 $N_{3/2}$ states, just as for $N_c=3$. One can show that the numerous nonstrange states in this multiplet have only 3 distinct mass eigenvalues out to $O(N_c^0)$,^{1,14,15} which we label $m_{0,1,2}$. Comparing the quantum numbers and multiplicities of such states with the results of Eqs. (1), one immediately finds¹ that exactly the required resonant poles are obtained if each K amplitude, $K=0, 1, 2$, contains precisely one pole, located at the value m_K . This quark-picture multiplet

of excited baryons is found to be *compatible* with, *i.e.*, consist of a complete set of, multiplets classified by K .

One can prove² compatibility for all nonstrange baryon multiplets in the $SU(6) \times O(3)$ shell picture, as well as for the whole $(\mathbf{70}, 1^-)$ multiplet⁶ if $K = \frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{2}$ poles are added. It is important to note that compatibility does *not* imply $SU(6)$ is an exact symmetry at large N_c for resonances as it is for ground states; rather, it says that $SU(6) \times O(3)$ multiplets are complete but *reducible* at large N_c . In the above example, $m_{0,1,2}$ are split at $O(N_c^0)$ and therefore label distinct multiplets. Indeed, large N_c by itself does not mandate the existence of *any* baryon resonances, but it does say that if even one exists, it must be a member of a well-defined multiplet.

3. Phenomenology

It is possible to obtain testable predictions for the decay channels, even using just the leading order in $1/N_c$. For example, we noted that the $K=0(1) N_{1/2}$ resonance couples only to $\eta(\pi)$. Indeed, the $N(1535)$ resonance decays to ηN with a 30–55% branching ratio (BR) despite lying barely above that threshold, while the $N(1650)$ decays to ηN with only a 3–10% BR despite having much more comparable πN and ηN phase spaces. This pattern clearly suggests¹ that the π -phobic $N(1535)$ should be identified with $K=0$ and the η -phobic $N(1650)$ with $K=1$, the first fully field theory-based explanation for these observations. Similarly, the $\Lambda(1670)$ lies only 5 MeV above the $\eta\Lambda$ threshold but has a 10–25% BR to this channel, and thus appears to lie in a $K=0$ $SU(3)$ octet with the $N(1535)$.⁶ Large N_c also provides⁶ $SU(3)$ selection rules: Octet resonances preferentially produce π and η in their decays, while singlet Λ 's produce $\bar{K}$'s.

Configuration mixing between states with 1, 2, *etc.* excited quarks, which requires an *ad hoc* treatment in the quark picture, naturally occurs in the scattering picture. If one finds two resonances of comparable mass and identical quantum numbers, and one has a natural broad $O(N_c^0)$ width, can the other have a narrow $O(1/N_c)$ width? Unless a conservation law forbids the mixing, both are expected to have $\Gamma = O(N_c^0)$. Indeed, one can exhibit³ $O(N_c^0)$ operators that allow such mixing.

The mandate that resonances occur in multiplets applies not only to conventional but exotic baryons as well. For example, a state with the quantum numbers of the controversial $\Theta^+(1540)$ ($I=0, J=\frac{1}{2}$) would necessarily have partners⁴ with $I=1, J=\frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{2}$ and $I=2, J=\frac{3}{2}, \frac{5}{2}$, degenerate in mass and width up to $O(1/N_c)$ corrections. Indeed, such a Θ^+ in an $SU(3)$ $\mathbf{10}$ would have degenerate **27** and **35** partners as well,⁴ an enumeration matching that found in a quark picture calculation.¹⁶

First-order $1/N_c$ corrections in amplitude relations like Eqs. (1) are handled⁵ (at least in the nonstrange case) simply by including $|I_t - J_t| = 1$ amplitudes in the analysis and identifying linear relations surviving among the enlarged set of physical amplitudes. When confronted with data, relations obtained in this way are typically a factor $N_c=3$ better satisfied than those that only hold to $O(N_c^0)$.

Processes other than meson-baryon scattering can also be treated using the

scattering approach, given only the I and J quantum numbers of the field coupling to the baryon along with the corresponding N_c power suppression of each coupling. For example, each multipole amplitude in pion photoproduction can be expressed in this way,⁷ once the photon is divided into its $I=1$ and $I=0$ pieces. Amplitude relations thus derived, including $1/N_c$ corrections, can be compared to data. The comparisons are favorable except in the resonant region, where the effects of finite $1/N_c$ splittings between resonances degenerate in the $N_c \rightarrow \infty$ limit obscure agreement. In fact, the helicity amplitudes on corresponding resonances derived from such seemingly disparate amplitudes turn out to agree remarkably well with $1/N_c$ expectations.⁷

The most interesting unsolved problems using the scattering method involve a proper treatment of $1/N_c$ effects. First, the $I_t = J_t$ and its incorporation of $1/N_c$ -suppressed amplitudes must be generalized to strange resonances. Second, many spurious states arise when $N_c > 3$; explaining how they decouple when N_c is tuned to 3 will open a broad new front for phenomenological results. Finally, a marriage of this approach with chiral symmetry (straightforward because of the connection to soliton models) will provide a very powerful additional set of physical constraints.

Acknowledgements

The author's research was supported by the N.S.F. through grant PHY-0140362.

References

1. T.D. Cohen and R.F. Lebed, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **91**, 012001 (2003); *Phys. Rev. D* **67**, 096008 (2003).
2. T.D. Cohen and R.F. Lebed, *Phys. Rev. D* **68**, 056003 (2003).
3. T.D. Cohen, D.C. Dakin, A. Nellore, and R.F. Lebed, *Phys. Rev. D* **69**, 056001 (2004).
4. T.D. Cohen and R.F. Lebed, *Phys. Lett. B* **578**, 150 (2004); *ibid.* **619**, 115 (2005).
5. T.D. Cohen, D.C. Dakin, A. Nellore, and R.F. Lebed, *Phys. Rev. D* **70**, 056004 (2004).
6. T.D. Cohen and R.F. Lebed, *Phys. Rev. D* **70**, 096015 (2004); [hep-ph/0507267](#) (to appear in *Phys. Rev. D*).
7. T.D. Cohen, D.C. Dakin, R.F. Lebed, and D.R. Martin, *Phys. Rev. D* **71**, 076010 (2005).
8. R.F. Lebed, [hep-ph/0406236](#), in *Continuous Advances in QCD 2004*, ed. by T. Gherghetta, World Scientific, Singapore (2004); [hep-ph/0501021](#), in *Large N_c QCD 2004*, ed. by J.L. Goity *et al.*, World Scientific, Singapore (2005); T.D. Cohen, *Nucl. Phys. A* **755**, 40 (2005).
9. R.F. Dashen and A.V. Manohar, *Phys. Lett. B* **315**, 425 (1993).
10. E. Jenkins, *Phys. Lett. B* **315**, 441 (1993).
11. D.B. Kaplan and M.J. Savage, *Phys. Lett. B* **365**, 244 (1996); D.B. Kaplan and A.V. Manohar, *Phys. Rev. C* **56**, 76 (1997).
12. M.P. Mattis and M. Mukerjee, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **61**, 1344 (1988).
13. M.P. Mattis, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **56**, 1103 (1986).
14. C.E. Carlson, C.D. Carone, J.L. Goity, and R.F. Lebed, *Phys. Lett. B* **438**, 327 (1998); *Phys. Rev. D* **59**, 114008 (1999).
15. D. Pirjol and C. Schat, *Phys. Rev. D* **67**, 096009 (2003).
16. E. Jenkins and A.V. Manohar, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **93**, 022001 (2004); *JHEP* **0406**, 039 (2004).